

MAR 28 1955

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Support)

SUBJECT: Agency Manpower Control System

1. THE PROBLEM

To provide a simple and effective basis for personnel strength and funds accounting which will lead to better manpower utilization and control.

2. ASSUMPTION

That it is essential for senior officials of this Agency to know where the on-duty strength is, how it is utilized, and what it costs, in order better to assess accomplishment in terms of mission and in order to provide a solid base for improved personnel administration.

3. APPROACH

- a. This problem breaks logically into two principal areas of consideration: (1) T/O and ceiling concepts and application; (2) personnel strength and funds accounting. This paper reflects that division in its development.
- b. Although the nature of the problem directs the principal emphasis to the DD/P Area, the recommendations in this paper are considered to be applicable on an Agency-wide basis.

See DD/S 57-1460

~~SECRET~~

PART I

T/O AND CEILING CONCEPTS AND APPLICATION

4. FACTS

- a. There is no uniform construction within the Agency of the terms "table of organization (T/O)" and "ceiling," either in the general sense, or in their particular pertinence to existing work burden or ceiling allocations.
- b. There is frequently no apparent relationship between ceiling allocations and previous or present work burdens.
- c. The tight holding of control reins on T/O-ceiling modifications (with the concomitant time-consuming processing of requests for modification) has produced an administrative bottleneck. The resultant sluggish administrative response to expressed change in operating need breeds procedural violation and administrative rubber-stamping of accomplished fact.
- d. There is no uniformity of practice with respect to the "slotting" of military personnel against T/O positions, even though such personnel are making a direct contribution against the work burden for which the T/O was established.

5. DISCUSSION

- a. The terms "T/O" and "ceiling" have not been clearly defined in this Agency, nor has their purpose as instruments of control been explained.
 - (1) The table-of-organization system of manpower control was brought into this Agency from the Armed Services, where its design is to serve basic small units of fixed status - with growth or expansion therefrom a simple matter of multiplication of units.
 - (2) In the attempt to apply the military T/O system, we have twisted it out of shape and concept, and have produced some bizarre results - the most significant and illustrative of which is the DD/P/FE field and headquarters T/O's with a combined total of [REDACTED] unoccupied positions.¹ These positions appear to be in excess of any foreseeable

25X9A2

¹ Manpower Survey of DD/P (FE Division Preliminary Report); memorandum of August 1954 to DCI from Chief, I&R.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

need and constitute what amounts to wholesale latitude for the maneuvering of employees for grade purposes. Such an application of the T/O concept (which is common in the DD/P Area) is far removed from the needed control concept of the T/O as an accurate transcription of mission in terms of necessary personnel, and produces as a by-product the psychological error of possession of unneeded slots.

(3) In addition to the T/O, we seek to apply the control of imposed ceilings. The imposed ceiling is a numbers control, as we have used it - an arbitrary imposition arising from a June 1952 on-board total; this total was split and dispersed to the Office level without true regard for bona fide need.

- b. Further compounding the T/O-ceiling confusion is a separate factor of administrative delay arising from tight holding of control reins. Under present construction, no modification in T/O-ceiling structure can be made without time-consuming administrative review and extremely narrow neck-of-the-bottle approval, extending even to the DD/S for completely nonsignificant matters. Operating need naturally produces violation of this procedure; the result is after-the-fact blessing and administrative action serving only to bring the records up to date. The DD/S's problem here is how and to whom to delegate authority within reasonable limits to meet already imposed responsibility, and yet reserve sufficient overall manpower controls.
- c. There is no policy governing the slotting of military personnel. Although they are under separately determined ceilings, military and civilian personnel are frequently integrated in their work assignments. Military personnel, however, are not always slotted against T/O positions; as a result, they are frequently not reflected as making a direct contribution against work burden.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- a. The military concept of a table-of-organization system does not fit the fluctuating responsibilities and needs of this Agency, especially within the Clandestine Services. The Agency is consequently the prisoner of an unfitting manpower control system which superimposes a numbers game (ceiling) on a maneuvering device (T/O), both of which are basically unrelated to current work burden.
- b. We need to substitute for the existing T/O-ceiling concept a simplified system, adapted to the needs of this Agency and with the inherent flexibility for quick accommodation to change in operating needs.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. Substitute for the table-of-organization concept, and for the term "T/O," the concept of the staffing pattern.
 - (1) Define staffing pattern as the manpower (number, type, and grade) necessary for any given organizational component to discharge its current work burden without formal replacement for usual absence.*
 - (2) Define current work burden as the workload stemming from the existing (exclusive of emergent) functional responsibilities of any given organizational component.
- b. Drop the use of the term "ceiling," and the concept of ceiling as an instrument of control, at the operating level. The staffing pattern, in effect, becomes ceiling at the operating level, thereby reducing the manpower controls at that level from three (ceiling, T/O, and budget) to two (staffing pattern and budget).
- c. Preserve the concept of ceiling at the Agency level, with Agency-wide application and control resident in the DCI.
- d. Review the present T/O's, field and headquarters, and convert them to staffing patterns which accurately reflect (in number, type, and grade) the manpower needed to discharge the current work burden.
- e. Provide for responsiveness to change in operating need by:
 - (1) Reasonable delegation of authority

Delegate to the three Deputy Directors (Plans, Intelligence, Support), to officials of the immediately subordinate organizational echelon, and to senior officials in the field (Senior Representatives, Chiefs of Mission, and Chiefs of Station) authority to transfer positions and/or personnel within their respective areas of jurisdiction, provided such transfers:

 - (a) Do not result in modification of basic organizational structure, nomenclature, or functions.
 - (b) Are to positions of comparable grade, classification, and career designation (in the case of personnel transfers).
 - (c) Are concurrently reported to the DD/S.
 - (2) Expedited processing of requests for staffing-pattern modification generated by a change in current work burden.

* Sick and annual leave, short periods of training, temporary duty (TDF), etc.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

- f. Relate military personnel to approved staffing patterns in exactly the same manner as civilian employees; i.e., slot them against approved staffing pattern positions.
- g. Review all staffing patterns once each year to determine their relevancy to current work burden - the Management Staff to have primary responsibility for review and for such coordination as may be required.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

PART II

PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING

4. FACTS

- a. Present personnel strength and funds accounting fails to reflect accurately the actual distribution of employees between (1) headquarters and field, (2) work-burden and non-work-burden assignment, and (3) overt and covert employment.
 - (1) Many instances have been found of employees physically located at headquarters, but charged against field T/O's, who were: (1) undergoing training extending over periods up to six months; or (2) returnees, either unassigned or in process of reassignment.
 - (2) Corollary to (1), above, is a substantial misuse of unvouchered funds to pay employees not in a covert status. To the extent that this situation exists, the accounting for OI (personnel) funds is misleading.
 - (3) There presently exists no mechanism for distinguishing in our personnel accounting between employees who are making a current contribution against work burden and those who are not.

5. DISCUSSION

- a. The relationship of headquarters to field personnel totals is ever and increasingly interesting to the Bureau of the Budget and to Congress. As they have expressed it, the question is: "How many employees are there in headquarters to support how many in the field?" The loose use of field T/O positions to cover training, permanent-change-of-station processing, etc. at headquarters, obscures the facts with respect to employee location (headquarters v. field), type of assignment (work-burden v. non-work-burden), and nature of employment (overt v. covert), thereby leaving us open to the accusation of evasion.
- b. The need to clean up T/O's so that they accurately reflect the location of employees, automatically spotlights the need for a new accounting category to accommodate employees who are not occupying work-burden T/O positions. No only would such a category carry no offense to Agency examiners (Bureau of Budget and Congress); it would demonstrate to them

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

good management. Reassignment, rotation, and supplemental training are understood and accepted as necessary.*

- c. The unvouchered funds accounting category is properly a device to protect covert operations and should serve automatically to distinguish covert from overt employment. Today this category is cluttered up and the totals are false by any definition. This is due primarily to the absence of administrative provision to ensure that the purpose of the unvouchered funds accounting category is respected. The result is that personnel who are physically located at headquarters are in many instances being paid from unvouchered funds unnecessarily; e.g., selectees for field assignment, for months in advance of their actual departure; returnees, for extended periods while they await reassignment; personnel performing regular duties at headquarters, but slotted against field T/O's.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- a. Our existing personnel accounting categories of (1) headquarters and field, and (2) vouchered and unvouchered funds, are inadequate to provide an accurate answer as to location (headquarters v. field), type of assignment (work-burden v. non-work-burden), or nature of employment (overt v. covert).
- b. We need in our personnel accounting:
 - (1) Clear and clean separation of employees by location (headquarters v. field) and by type of assignment (work-burden v. non-work-burden), so that automatically there exists current and high-lighted information as to where we stand personnel-wise, and where administrative attention is most needed.
 - (2) Improved discernment and control in the use of the vouchered and unvouchered funds categories, with consequent improved distinction between overt and covert employment.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. Establish a third personnel-accounting category to accommodate:
 - (1) Recruits, from time of selection, through the period of initial training (if any), until they assume their duties on a work-burden staffing pattern.

* It is interesting to note that the Wriston Committee, conducting a manpower survey in the State Department, found that the non-productive manpower in the Foreign Service (i.e., personnel in the status of reassignment, training, and rotation) amounted to 25% of the total Foreign Service payroll.

SECRET

SECRET


Approved For Release 2001/08/10 : CIA-RDP78-04718A001700030016-5

- (2) Employees detached from their duties on a work-burden staffing pattern for permanent change of station, rotation, career development, extended training or leave, etc., and for whom formal replacement is required.

This third category, without a staffing-pattern structure, would provide (1) the needed flexibility for operating components to keep their work-burden staffing patterns fully manned, and (2) a consolidation and high-lighting of personnel not currently contributing against the Agency's work burden, thus facilitating administrative analysis and control of this group.

- b. Exercise control over the third category through (1) the budget, and (2) administrative scrutiny.
 - (1) Base budgetary control on a modification of present budgeting procedure and refine it progressively on the basis of experience. (It is contemplated that for the remainder of the current fiscal year, 01 funds in present budgets in excess of work-burden staffing pattern requirements would be used for this third category. A specific budget allotment for the third category would be established as of the beginning of the new fiscal year.)
 - (2) Analyze monthly the composition of this third category, by group (e.g., returnees awaiting reassignment, outbound personnel, EOD or extended training, extended leave, recruitment and pipeline processing, etc.), for rigorous administrative scrutiny at the responsible levels and by the DD/S.
- c. Clean up our existing T/O's by transferring incumbents of present T/O positions to positions in the newly established staffing patterns or to the third category, as appropriate.
- d. To the maximum extent consistent with the security of covert operations, utilize vouchered funds for the payment of employees in the third category.

/s/


Chief, Management Staff

25X1A9a

Approved For Release 2001/08/10 : CIA-RDP78-04718A001700030016-5

SECRET